

BEFORE THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

IN THE MATTER OF CHARGES FILED AGAINST)
SERGEANT EDDIE YOSHIMURA,) No. 12 PB 2785
STAR No. 2334, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,)
CITY OF CHICAGO,)
)
AND)
)
IN THE MATTER OF CHARGES FILED AGAINST)
LIEUTENANT ANTHONY CEJA,) No. 12 PB 2786
STAR No. 672, DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,)
CITY OF CHICAGO,)
)
RESPONDENTS.) (CR No. 1022600)

FINDINGS AND DECISIONS

On January 9, 2012, the Superintendent of Police filed with the Police Board of the City of Chicago charges against Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura, Star No. 2334, and Lieutenant Anthony Ceja, Star No. 672, (hereinafter sometimes referred to as “Respondents”), recommending that the Respondents be discharged from the Chicago Police Department for violating several Rules of Conduct.

On January 30, 2012, Thomas E. Johnson, Hearing Officer of the Police Board, ordered the cases consolidated for purposes of discovery and hearing without objection from the parties.

The Police Board caused a hearing on these charges against the Respondents to be had before Hearing Officer Johnson on April 19 and 20, 2012.

Following the hearing, the members of the Police Board read and reviewed the record of proceedings and viewed the video-recording of the testimony of the witnesses. Hearing Officer Johnson made an oral report to and conferred with the Police Board before it rendered its

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

findings and decisions. (Board members Scott J. Davis and Ghian Foreman recused themselves from this case pursuant to §2-57-060(c) of the Municipal Code of Chicago.)

POLICE BOARD FINDINGS

The Police Board of the City of Chicago, as a result of its hearing on the charges, finds and determines that:

1. Each Respondent was at all times mentioned herein employed as a sworn member of the Department of Police of the City of Chicago.
2. The written charges, and a Notice stating when and where a hearing on the charges was to be held, were served upon each Respondent more than five (5) days prior to the hearing on the charges.
3. Throughout the hearing on the charges each Respondent appeared in person and was represented by legal counsel.
4. The Respondents' Motion to Dismiss Charges Against the Respondents is **denied** for the reasons set forth below. The Respondents seek to have the charges filed against them dismissed because the incident occurred on December 21, 2008, IPRA was promptly notified and involved, and most of the witnesses had been identified and interviewed promptly, but the charges in this case were not filed with the Police Board until January 9, 2012. The Respondents argue that the delay in bringing the charges violates the Respondents' due process rights, the Police Department's General Order G08-01(I)(B), and section 2-84-430 of the Municipal Code of Chicago (both of which require prompt and thorough investigation of police misconduct). The Respondents also contend that the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) violated its

obligations under sections 2-57-060 and 2-57-070 of the Municipal Code.

a. Due Process. Citing *Morgan v. Department of Financial and Professional Regulation*, 374 Ill.App.3d 275, 871 NE2d 178 (1st Dist 2007), the Respondents claim that the Constitution precludes such a lengthy delay in the investigation of the Respondents' alleged misconduct. *Morgan*, however, involved delay in *adjudication* of allegations of misconduct after the plaintiff had been suspended from his job—not delay in the *investigation* leading to the initial suspensions. *Morgan* involved a clinical psychologist accused of sexually abusing a patient, where the state took fifteen months to decide the case after the suspension.

The Respondents' case before the Police Board is different, as the Respondents are complaining about the delay from the time of the incident to the bringing of charges, not the time it took to try them once the charges were filed and they were suspended without pay. The difference is important because the due-process analysis in *Morgan* is triggered by the state's decision to deprive the psychologist of his job, thus preventing him from working for a prolonged period of time before he was accorded the opportunity to have a hearing and decision to clear his name. Here, the Respondents were working and were being paid their full salary and benefits during the entire period of the investigation and up to the filing of charges with the Police Board. The Due Process clause precludes a state or local government from "depriving any person of life, liberty or property [i.e. a public job] without due process of law." Here, the Respondents were not suspended without pay from their jobs until January 11, 2012, two days after the charges against them were filed, and therefore the Respondents were *not* deprived of their jobs prior to the filing of charges, and any delay in bringing the charges is therefore *not* a violation of the Respondents' due process rights.

We recognize that the Circuit Court of Cook County, in *Orsa v. City of Chicago Police Board*, 11 CH 08166 (March 1, 2012), found that the protections of the Due Process clause are triggered by an unreasonable delay in the investigation of a matter, even if the officer retains his job, salary, and benefits during the investigation. The Court cited *Stull v. The Department of Children and Family Services*, 239 Ill.App.3d 325 (5th Dist. 1992). *Stull* involved a teacher accused of sexually abusing two of his students. The statute and regulations governing DCFS investigations of child abuse provided strict time limits on the length of any investigation and on the time within which a hearing must be conducted and a decision entered if the adult found to have abused children sought a hearing. The *Stull* court found that DCFS had grossly violated these time limits and required expungement of the adverse finding against the teacher, even though the administrative appeal found that he had been properly “indicated” as an abuser. The *Stull* court did find that the teacher’s due process rights had been infringed but it was not because of a delay in DCFS’s investigation of the case. The court held that due process was violated by the more than one-year delay in adjudicating the teacher’s appeal because during that period of time there was an indicated finding of child abuse lodged against the teacher and this finding prohibited him from working, *see* 239 Ill.App.3d at 335, thus triggering the kind of deprivation that is not present in Lt. Ceja and Sgt. Yoshimura’s case. *Cavaretta v. Department of Children and Family Services*, 277 Ill.App.3d 16 (2nd Dist. 1996), also cited by the Circuit Court, is identical to *Stull*, which it relies upon. The *Cavaretta* court was quite careful to find that due process was not implicated until DCFS (after its investigation was complete) “indicated” the teacher as a child abuser and placed the teacher’s name in the state’s central registry, which

directly deprived the teacher of the inability to work.¹

b. Municipal Code Section 2-84-430 and General Order G 08-01(I)(B). The Respondents argue that the Municipal Code and the Police Department's own General Order require prompt and thorough investigation, and that the Department failed to fully comply with these provisions. In fact, neither section 2-84-430 nor the General Order set an absolute deadline within which investigations must be completed. The General Order provides that if investigations last more than 30 days, the investigator must seek and obtain an extension of time within which to complete the investigation. Here, the investigator regularly did seek, and was granted, extensions of time, in compliance with the General Order.

Once the investigator completed the process of gathering evidence, the matter is reviewed at several levels to ensure that a thorough investigation was conducted, as required by the General Order.

Moreover, even if section 2-84-430 or the General Order was violated, there is no provision in either the Municipal Code or the General Order requiring the extraordinary remedy of dismissal as a sanction for such a violation.

c. Municipal Code Section 2-57-070. The Code provides that the Chief Administrator of the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) must conclude an investigation within six months or else report the reasons for not concluding it to the Mayor, the City Council, the complainant and the officer. The Respondent argues that IPRA did not comply with this provision of the Code, as IPRA supplied inadequate notice to the Respondents and did not notify

¹ The Circuit Court also cited *Cleveland Board of Education v Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532 (1985), but only in general terms. There was no issue in *Loudermill* that a deprivation, for due process purposes, had occurred as it involved the discharge of school district employees.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

the City Council or the Mayor.

Pursuant to the ordinance, on or about June 26, 2009, IPRA sent each Respondent a letter informing him that allegations were made against him and providing a reason that the investigation was not yet completed.

In any event, neither Section 2-57-070 nor anything else in the Code states that dismissal of a Police Board case is the sanction for failing to make the report to the Mayor, the City Council, the officer, and the complainant. It is unpersuasive that such an extreme sanction would automatically follow. Without any basis or cited authority, and none is given by the Respondents, there is no basis for the Board to dismiss the charges pursuant to Section 2-57-070, and the Board declines to extend the reach of the ordinance in this manner.

d. Municipal Code Section 2-57-060. In this case, the Superintendent of Police objected in writing to IPRA's recommendation to discharge the Respondents. IPRA, however, insisted on seeking discharge. The ordinance requires that the Chief Administrator of IPRA then meet with the Superintendent within ten business days of when the Superintendent objects to IPRA's recommendation, and if they do not reach agreement, then IPRA has five additional business days within which to refer the matter to a review panel consisting of three Police Board members.

The Respondents claim that the deadlines of the Ordinance were not honored. The Respondents are incorrect. Here, the Superintendent objected in writing to IPRA's recommendation on June 3, 2011. According to the Chief Administrator's Certificate of Meeting and Service filed with the three-member panel, the required meeting took place on June 17, 2011, ten business days after June 3. At that meeting agreement was reached regarding Sergeant

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

Yoshimura, but not regarding Lieutenant Ceja. IPRA then referred the Ceja matter to the three-member panel on June 24, 2011, five business days after June 17.

No violation of section 2-57-060 occurred here. Even if one did, however, there is nothing in the ordinance to suggest that dismissal of the pending charges is an appropriate remedy for a violation of the ordinance, and the Board declines to expand the ordinance in this way.

5. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 2: Any action or conduct which impedes the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals or brings discredit upon the Department,
in that:

Sergeant Yoshimura's overall actions impeded the Department's efforts to achieve its policy and goals and/or brought discredit upon the Department when on or about December 21, 2008, he discharged OC spray without justification in a public place, and/or he failed to make the required notifications after discharging the OC spray, and/or he failed to complete a Tactical Response Report, and/or he submitted a false report dated December 23, 2008, and/or on or about March 18 and/or on or about May 1, 2009, he made false statements to the Independent Police Review Authority.

See the findings set forth in paragraph nos. 6-11 below, which are incorporated here by reference.

6. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral,
in that:

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

Count I: On or about December 21, 2008, Sergeant Yoshimura failed to make the required notifications after discharging OC spray, in violation of General Order 02-08-05.

Sergeant Yoshimura claims that he failed to make the required notifications after the discharge of his OC spray because he did not realize the discharge had occurred until two days later. The Board, however, finds that Sgt. Yoshimura did know that he had discharged his OC spray, as it credits the testimony of Chaley Pomrenke, who clearly notices the spray on the videotape of the incident and then testified that she asked Sgt. Yoshimura if that was his mace. The Board finds Ms. Pomrenke's testimony credible on this point, and when she testified that she asked Lt. Ceja if the spray should have a safety. The tape clearly supports Ms. Pomrenke's further testimony that after observing the effects of the spray in the restaurant, she summoned Lt. Ceja back to the area where the discharge had occurred in order to ask what, if anything, he was going to do about the situation. The videotape clearly shows the officers hurrying to leave the restaurant, and one officer is coughing as he leaves.

Wholly apart from Ms. Pomrenke's testimony, Sgt. Yoshimura testified that he waited for two to five minutes outside the restaurant for his car. The tape shows him leaving the restaurant between 2:10 and 2:14 (on the tape's timer) and patrons affected by the spray leave the restaurant less than two minutes later, beginning at 4:00 (on the tape's timer). Hence, these affected patrons would be outside the restaurant while Sgt. Yoshimura was outside the restaurant, and it is unreasonable to conclude that Sgt. Yoshimura, an experienced police officer, did not observe that a problem involving OC spray had occurred inside the restaurant. As Sgt. Yoshimura knew that OC spray had been discharged in the restaurant, and he made no attempt to address the problem, including making the required notifications and completing the required reports, he is guilty of this charge.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

7. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral, in that:

Count II: On or about December 21, 2008, Sergeant Yoshimura failed to complete a Tactical Response Report after discharging OC spray, in violation of General Order 02-08-05.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 6 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

8. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 10: Inattention to duty, in that:

On or about December 21, 2008, Sergeant Yoshimura was inattentive to duty when he discharged OC spray in a public place, and/or failed to make the required notifications, and/or failed to complete a Tactical Response Report.

The videotape clearly shows that Sgt. Yoshimura discharges his OC spray while rummaging through his pockets as he is preparing to leave the restaurant. The safety for the OC spray had apparently been left off. While Sgt. Yoshimura claims that he did not know he had discharged his OC spray, the evidence presented at the hearing shows that he knew of the discharge and still failed to make the required notifications, as is further described in paragraph no. 6 above.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

9. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 14: Making a false report, written or oral,
in that:

Count I: On or about December 23, 2008, Sergeant Yoshimura submitted a false report regarding his knowledge of and actions during the incident that occurred on or about December 21, 2008, at Brazzaz Restaurant, located at 539 North Dearborn Street, Chicago.

The Board finds that Sgt. Yoshimura was not truthful in his December 23, 2008, report when he indicated that he did not know he had discharged his OC spray. As set out in paragraph no. 6 above, the evidence establishes that Sgt. Yoshimura knew he had discharged his OC spray.

10. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 14: Making a false report, written or oral,
in that:

Count II: On or about March 18, 2009, Sergeant Yoshimura gave a false statement to the Independent Police Review Authority regarding his knowledge of and actions during the incident that occurred on or about December 21, 2008, at Brazzaz Restaurant, located at 539 North Dearborn Street, Chicago.

In his March 18, 2009, statement, Sgt. Yoshimura indicated he was not aware that his OC spray had been discharged but also that Ms. Pomrenke never made any statement about it, and that he did not see anyone suffering the effects of the OC spray. Based on the evidence, as summarized in paragraph no. 6 above, the Board finds that each of these statements is not truthful.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

11. The Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 14: Making a false report, written or oral,
in that:

Count III: On or about May 1, 2009, Sergeant Yoshimura gave a false statement to the Independent Police Review Authority regarding his knowledge of and actions during the incident that occurred on or about December 21, 2008, at Brazzaz Restaurant, located at 539 North Dearborn Street, Chicago.

In his May 1, 2009, statement, Sgt. Yoshimura indicated that his prior statements were truthful, that he had no knowledge of the discharge of his OC spray, and that Ms. Pomrenke did not ask about the spray. As indicated in the findings in paragraph no. 6, all of these statements are not truthful.

12. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 3: Any failure to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals,
in that:

Lieutenant Ceja failed to promote the Department's efforts to implement its policy or accomplish its goals when on or about December 21, 2008, he became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct and obtain a complaint register number, and/or he failed to ensure that the required notifications of OC discharge were made, and/or he failed to ensure that a Tactical Response Report on the OC discharge was completed, and/or on or about March 17 and/or on or about May 1, 2009, he made false statements to the Independent Police Review Authority.

See the findings set forth in paragraph nos. 13-17 below, which are incorporated here by reference.

13. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral, in that:

Count I: On or about December 21, 2008, Lieutenant Ceja became aware of possible misconduct and failed to report the misconduct and obtain a complaint register number, in violation of General Order 93-03-02B.

Lt. Ceja claims that he was unaware of the discharge of Sgt. Yoshimura's OC spray. The videotape, however, shows him in close proximity to the spray when it is discharged. Lt. Ceja conceded in his testimony that one can smell OC spray when it is discharged. Ms. Pomrenke testified that she asked Sgt. Yoshimura if that was his mace, when it went off, and further asked whether there should have been a safety on the OC spray, and Lt. Ceja indicated there should have been. While Lt. Ceja denies that Ms. Pomrenke made these statements, the Board finds her testimony credible and corroborated by the videotape. Further, it is quite clear that Ms. Pomrenke calls Lt. Ceja back to the location of the discharge after she notices the effect of the spray in the restaurant. While Lt. Ceja claims that he goes back into the restaurant merely to say good-bye and wish a Merry Christmas to Officers Mora and Gonzalez, the Board does not believe his testimony. The videotape clearly shows Ms. Pomrenke summoning him to the area where the discharge occurred and talking to him. In addition, the rapid departure of many patrons, as is evident on the videotape, clearly should have made Lt. Ceja aware of the problem inside the restaurant. The Board finds that Lt. Ceja clearly was aware of the discharge of the OC spray and failed to report this possible misconduct or obtain a CR number, in violation of Department policy.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

14. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral, in that:

Count II: On or about December 21, 2008, Lieutenant Ceja violated General Order 02-08-05, in that he failed to ensure that Sergeant Yoshimura made the required notifications of an OC discharge.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 13 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

15. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 6: Disobedience of an order or directive, whether written or oral, in that:

Count III: On or about December 21, 2008, Lieutenant Ceja violated General Order 02-08-05, in that he failed to ensure that Sergeant Yoshimura completed a tactical response report on an OC discharge.

See the findings set forth in paragraph no. 13 above, which are incorporated here by reference.

16. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 14: Making a false report, written or oral, in that:

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

Count I: On or about March 17, 2009, Lieutenant Ceja gave a false statement to the Independent Police Review Authority regarding his knowledge of and actions during the incident that occurred on or about December 21, 2008, at Brazzaz Restaurant, located at 539 North Dearborn Street, Chicago.

In his March 17, 2009, statement, Lt. Ceja indicated that he did not hear the discharge of Sgt. Yoshimura's OC spray, that Ms. Pomrenke just made small talk and did not inform him that OC spray had been discharged, that no misconduct occurred on the part of Sgt. Yoshimura, and he knew of no one with knowledge of the incident. For the reasons set forth above in paragraph no. 13, these statements are not truthful.

17. The Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, charged herein, is **guilty** of violating, to wit:

Rule 14: Making a false report, written or oral,
in that:

Count II: On or about May 1, 2009, Lieutenant Ceja gave a false statement to the Independent Police Review Authority regarding his knowledge of and actions during the incident that occurred on or about December 21, 2008, at Brazzaz Restaurant, located at 539 North Dearborn Street, Chicago.

In his May 1, 2009, statement, Lt. Ceja said that his prior statement was truthful, that Ms. Pomrenke called him back into the restaurant just for small talk and did not make any reference to the OC spray. Based on the Board's findings set forth in paragraph no. 13 above, all of these statements are not truthful.

18. The Police Board has considered the facts and circumstances of the Respondents' conduct, and the evidence presented in defense and mitigation. The Police Board finds and

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

determines that a suspension of each Respondent is the appropriate penalty in these cases.

The Respondents plainly violated the rules that govern situations involving the accidental discharge of OC spray. Moreover, it is clear they attempted to cover up the misconduct relating to the inadvertent incident, thereby converting a relatively minor problem into a major one. Nonetheless, the Board finds that discharging the Respondents from the Chicago Police Department is not warranted. Each Respondent has more than 25 years on the job, has no disciplinary history, and has numerous awards and commendations. Based on their records and years of service to the Department, the Board finds that suspensions are a more fitting punishment on the facts of these particular cases.

BY REASON OF THE FINDINGS set forth herein, cause exists for suspending Respondent Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura, Star No. 2334, from his position as a sergeant of police with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago, for a period of thirty (30) days, from January 11, 2012, to and including, February 9, 2012, and cause exists for suspending Respondent Lieutenant Anthony Ceja, Star No. 672, from his position as a lieutenant of police with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago, for a period of thirty (30) days, from January 11, 2012, to and including, February 9, 2012.

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

POLICE BOARD DECISION

The Police Board of the City of Chicago, having read and reviewed the record of proceedings in this case, having viewed the video-recording of the testimony of the witnesses, having received the oral report of the Hearing Officer, Thomas E. Johnson, and having conferred with the Hearing Officer on the credibility of the witnesses and the evidence, hereby adopts all findings herein; and, in reaching its decision as to the penalty imposed, the Board has taken into account not only the facts of this case but also the Respondent's complimentary and disciplinary histories, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Respondent, **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**, Star No. 2334, as a result of having been found **guilty** of charges in Police Board Case No. 12 PB 2785, be and hereby is **suspended** from his position as a sergeant of police with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago, for a period from January 11, 2012, to and including February 9, 2012 (thirty days).

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 31st DAY OF MAY, 2012.

/s/ Demetrius E. Carney
/s/ William F. Conlon
/s/ Rita A. Fry
/s/ Susan L. McKeever
/s/ Johnny L. Miller
/s/ Elisa Rodriguez

Attested by:

/s/ Max A. Caproni
Executive Director
Police Board

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

DISSENT

The following members of the Police Board hereby dissent from the Decision of the majority of the Board with regard to **Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura**.

[None]

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

POLICE BOARD DECISION

The Police Board of the City of Chicago, having read and reviewed the record of proceedings in this case, having viewed the video-recording of the testimony of the witnesses, having received the oral report of the Hearing Officer, Thomas E. Johnson, and having conferred with the Hearing Officer on the credibility of the witnesses and the evidence, hereby adopts all findings herein; and, in reaching its decision as to the penalty imposed, the Board has taken into account not only the facts of this case but also the Respondent's complimentary and disciplinary histories, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Respondent, **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**, Star No. 672, as a result of having been found **guilty** of charges in Police Board Case No. 12 PB 2786, be and hereby is **suspended** from his position as a lieutenant of police with the Department of Police, and from the services of the City of Chicago, for a period from January 11, 2012, to and including February 9, 2012 (thirty days).

DATED AT CHICAGO, COUNTY OF COOK, STATE OF ILLINOIS, THIS 31st DAY OF MAY, 2012.

/s/ Demetrius E. Carney
/s/ William F. Conlon
/s/ Rita A. Fry
/s/ Susan L. McKeever
/s/ Johnny L. Miller
/s/ Elisa Rodriguez

Attested by:

/s/ Max A. Caproni
Executive Director
Police Board

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

DISSENT

The following members of the Police Board hereby dissent from the Decision of the majority of the Board with regard to **Lieutenant Anthony Ceja**.

[None]

RECEIVED A COPY OF
THE FOREGOING COMMUNICATION
THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2012.

SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

Report Date: 09 Jan 2012
Report Time: 1327 Hrs

Information Services Division
Data Warehouse
Produced by: IL01656AEC

1 / 1 Main Report 100%

Chicago Police Department
Personnel Division
**Only for active personnel*

Complimentary History					
Name	Title	Star	Unit	Detail Unit	Emp Number
YOSHIMURA, EDDIE M	9171	2334	193		██████████
Achievements					
ATTENDANCE RECOGNITION AWARD					2
COMPLIMENTARY LETTER					2
2004 CRIME REDUCTION RIBBON					1
DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER AWARD					1
HONORABLE MENTION					15
DEPARTMENT COMMENDATION					1
OTHER AWARDS					1
POLICE OFFICER OF THE MONTH AWARD					3
2009 CRIME REDUCTION AWARD					1
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION DEPLOYMENT AWARD 2008					1
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION AWARD					1
TOTAL AWARDS					<u>29</u>



Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

**BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS
RECORDS SECTION**

DEC 20, 2011

TO: COMMANDING OFFICER UNIT 113

**FROM: RECORDS SECTION
INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION**

SUBJECT: PREVIOUS SUSTAINED DISCIPLINARY HISTORY OF:

YOSHIMURA EDDIE 2334 193

NAME (LAST,FIRST) STAR UNIT

M API [REDACTED]

SEX RACE EMPLOYEE#

REFERENCE: COMPLAINT REGISTER/ LOG NUMBER 1022600

**THE PREVIOUS SUSTAINED DISCIPLINARY HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT
ACCUSED HAS BEEN REQUESTED IN YOUR NAME BY:**

D.C. MUELLENBACH [REDACTED] 113

RANK NAME STAR EMPLOYEE# UNIT

**RELATIVE TO A SUSTAINED FINDING IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THE
ABOVE REFERENCE COMPLAINT LOG NUMBER.**

**THE RECORDS SECTION, INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION, DISCLOSED THE
FOLLOWING DISCIPLINARY ACTION ADMINISTERED TO THE SUBJECT
ACCUSED FOR THE PAST FIVE(5) YEARS.**

VERIFIED/PREPARED BY:

BERNETTE KELLY

**NONE
SEE ATTACHED**

**FOR: COMMANDING OFFICER
RECORDS SECTION
INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION**

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

Report Date: 09 Jan 2012
Report Time: 1326 Hrs

Information Services Division
Data Warehouse
Produced by: IL0-656AEC

Chicago Police Department
Personnel Division
*Only for active personnel

Complimentary History

Name	Title	Star	Unit	Detail Unit	Emp Number
CEJA, ANTHONY J	9173	672	025	009	██████████

Achievements

	Total No.
HONORABLE MENTION	53
OTHER AWARDS	2
ATTENDANCE RECOGNITION AWARD	1
2009 CRIME REDUCTION AWARD	1
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION DEPLOYMENT AWARD 2008	1
DEPARTMENT COMMENDATION	3
COMPLIMENTARY LETTER	8
DEPLOYMENT OPERATIONS CENTER AWARD	1
2004 CRIME REDUCTION RIBBON	1
EMBLEM OF RECOGNITION - PHYSICAL FITNESS	1
HONORABLE MENTION RIBBON AWARD	1
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION AWARD	1
TOTAL AWARDS	74

Police Board Case Nos. 12 PB 2785 & 2786
Sergeant Eddie Yoshimura & Lieutenant Anthony Ceja
Findings and Decisions

BUREAU OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS
RECORDS SECTION

DEC 20, 2011

TO: COMMANDING OFFICER UNIT 113
FROM: RECORDS SECTION
INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION
SUBJECT: PREVIOUS SUSTAINED DISCIPLINARY HISTORY OF:

CEJA	ANTHONY	672	009
NAME	(LAST,FIRST)	STAR	UNIT
M	H	[REDACTED]	
SEX	RACE	EMPLOYEE#	

REFERENCE: COMPLAINT REGISTER/ LOG NUMBER 1022600

THE PREVIOUS SUSTAINED DISCIPLINARY HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT
ACCUSED HAS BEEN REQUESTED IN YOUR NAME BY:

D.C.	MUELLENBACH	[REDACTED]	113	
RANK	NAME	STAR	EMPLOYEE#	UNIT

RELATIVE TO A SUSTAINED FINDING IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THE
ABOVE REFERENCE COMPLAINT LOG NUMBER.

THE RECORDS SECTION, INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION, DISCLOSED THE
FOLLOWING DISCIPLINARY ACTION ADMINISTERED TO THE SUBJECT
ACCUSED FOR THE PAST FIVE(5) YEARS.

VERIFIED/PREPARED BY:

BERNETTE KELLY

NONE
SEE ATTACHED

FOR: COMMANDING OFFICER
RECORDS SECTION
INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION